

# Europe's Wave of Violence, War's By-Product

The Increase in Crime in Both England and France Is Ascribed to War Training, Declares This British Writer

London, England, March, 1920.

EARLY in 1917 the present writer and an acquaintance were walking late one night through a narrow street in a big industrial town in England. Hearing a woman's screams from one of the miserable lodging houses which formed most of the street, they sought a policeman. He ascertained that an old friend of the police, returned from prison, was threatening the wife for a murderous assault on whom he had just served a term; then he continued cheerily—"When the war's over, you'd better not come down this street. We used only to patrol this beat two men at a time. It's better now, for most of the old jail-birds are safely in the army, but when the war ends they'll all be back again—more of them loose than there've ever been before and then we'll see some lively times."

The policeman was right, as the present crime-wave proves. It is a direct product of the war and, so far as Europe is concerned, is rife not only in England but as much or even more in Paris and Berlin. In England there have been within the last eight months at least a dozen brutal murders of which the perpetrators have not been brought to justice; half of them have taken place within the last few weeks and in most cases (as with the quite different political murders in Ireland) the police have not even effected an arrest. Crimes of violence may furnish a sensation, but they are not themselves of serious interest except insofar as they illustrate the mentality of a people or a time. The present wave is worth attention precisely because it largely springs from the demoralization consequent on war.

Ultimately war may be decided by moral force, but its immediate weapons are brute force, violence, surprise. These are the characteristics of the present outbreak. If men are taught for years that the main object of their training is the more efficient use of bayonet and bomb and that the harsh discipline to which they are submitted has this end in view, it is not to be supposed that when the discipline is suddenly relaxed they will at once forget the lesson and revert to the sense of moral order and mutual restraint from which they were violently shaken by the war. It is not in the least an accident that the greater part of the murders recently committed in this country have been crimes of sheer brute violence comparable with the killing done in the heat of hand-to-hand combat with the butt-end of a rifle. That terrible feature by itself distinguishes these crimes from those of peace

## From an English Correspondent

and labels them as a product of the violent shock of war.

The characteristics of the outbreak involve more than murder. It will be remembered that in the days of the Russian Revolution of 1905, when the revolutionaries pitted their own violence against that of the Czarist government, there were innumerable cases of the "hold-up," the feature of which was a surprise raid on some bank or post office whose funds were to be seized. This country is now having a similar experience; almost every week a branch of some bank or post office—especially post offices which are largely staffed by women clerks—is held up by armed men. The most casual observer cannot fail to see in this the direct result of the lesson which every soldier learns in war, that surprise attack, the sudden appearance in superior strength, is the easiest and most certain road to victory. The post office hold-up is only the trench raid transferred to peace and civil life.

Another feature of the day is the tendency of criminals to act on a more ambitious scale, to use firearms against the police and to operate in gangs. The warehouse quarters of London have recently been the hunting-ground of a gang of about twenty men. Part of the gang would break into a warehouse in the early evening and spend the night in packing up goods all ready for removal. Early in the morning would come the remainder of the gang with a big wagon and while some kept watch and dealt with intruders, the rest would load the spoil in the wagon and transport it rapidly to the hiding place provided.

A certain proportion of these crimes is unquestionably due to the "old hands" who had spent many years in prison before the war and will gradually be rounded up and put there again. The leader of the gang already mentioned was a well-known and expert criminal and recently a hardened burglar was sent to prison who, after having served well and faithfully in the war, returned to his old occupation within a few weeks of his final release from the army. Of two brothers in Berlin who have recently committed a remarkable series of crimes one had precisely the same record. It cannot be said of these men, as of many others, that they learned violence from the war. They are of the professional class and had the trick already, but their

natural propensities have been increased and sharpened by their experiences in respect both of the normal rigid discipline and of the compulsion to the extreme of violence which war brings with it.

In Paris the crime-wave has two special features which have not been noticed in this country. When the war ended, Paris was the home of deserters of many nations—many of them criminals and bad characters—and ever since the armistice the police have been organizing raids and "drives" to root them out. But the curious thing is not that there are many "new criminals" in France, for both England and Germany have their counterpart, but that many of them are youths of sixteen or seventeen years. In England we have our juvenile crime, which many people say has increased greatly during and since the war, and we attribute it variously to lack of parental control or the demoralizing influence of the film of violence. But the crime of the adolescent youth seems to be specially a feature of Paris violence.

Whatever explanation is accepted, we come back to the war. Some say that it is not the grown man only, who did the actual fighting, but the youth also who has been growing up in the same atmosphere, that has had his moral sense blunted, has lost the respect for social order and discipline which in normal times he takes as an accepted part of his system, and has come to believe that force and violence will give him what he wants, even at the cost of human life, which anyway in the new philosophy is cheap. And this is really the most reasonable explanation, for the only other that is offered is the prolonged absence of fathers from their families during the war, which is only to say that the war-cult of violence ran riot in the home no less than in the field.

There is no moral to be drawn from the wave of crime except that the war-spirit does not die with war. War is waged with material weapons, but its process is worked out in the human spirit. Spiritually, however necessary and inevitable a war may sometimes be, it is a reversion to the ideas of a primitive and savage state. Not every mind is so rooted in the ideas of duty and of social obligation that when the recall sounds it can restore the mental balance which the war had overthrown. Long after the "old hands" are back in prison we shall suffer for the years in which we had to enthrone brute force over the head of reason and social justice.

## Which Presidential Cabinet Had the Most Members?

Changes in Wilson's Portfolio Recall Shifts of Other Days

ON ACCOUNT of several changes in President Wilson's cabinet during recent months, it has become quite popular for many people to make the bald assertion that more men have served in the Wilson cabinet than in the cabinet of any other President. There were considerably more changes among cabinet officers during the Roosevelt and Grant administrations than has been the case thus far during the Wilson régime.

A total of 29 men served in the cabinet of Theodore Roosevelt. That was the high record in the country's history. During that administration there were six different secretaries of the Navy; five postmasters general, three secretaries of State, three secretaries of the Treasury, three secretaries of War, three secretaries of Commerce and Labor, three attorney-generals, and two secretaries of the Interior. James Wilson, secretary of Agriculture, was the only man who served in the Roosevelt cabinet during the entire administration.

Twenty-five changes were made during Grant's administration, and there were only seven cabinet portfolios at that time, whereas at present there are ten. President Grant had five secretaries of War, five attorney-generals, four postmasters general, four secretaries of the Treasury, two secretaries of State, two secretaries of the Navy and three secretaries of the Interior.

President Tyler had 20 different men in his cabinet, and in his time there were only six departments with cabinet officers at the head. He had five secretaries of the Navy, four secretaries of the Treasury,

three each in the state, war, and attorney-general's departments, and two postmasters general.

With the appointment of a successor to Secretary Lansing, a total of 20 men will have served in the Wilson cabinet.

Andrew Jackson came within one of having as

House for an interval, had 11 cabinet officers during his first term and 12 during his second.

The only Presidents who never made any changes in their original appointments were: William Henry Harrison, Zachary Taylor, Franklin Pierce and James A. Garfield. Even George Washington seemed to have considerable difficulty in keeping appointees in his cabinet. His record was four secretaries of State, three secretaries of War, three postmasters general, three attorney-generals and two secretaries of the Treasury. There was no such official as secretary of the Navy at that time.

From John Adams to and including Polk, the cabinet consisted of six members. The secretary of the Interior was added with the Taylor administration. The next addition was that of Agriculture, which was inaugurated during Cleveland's first term. The Department of Commerce and Labor was born during the Roosevelt era. These two departments were later divided and under the present administration there is a member of the cabinet for each of them.

Following are the number of changes that took place in the cabinets of all of the Presidents: Washington, 15; Adams, 8; Jefferson, 11; Madison, 18; Monroe, 11; John Quincy Adams, 7; Jackson, 19; Van Buren, 10; Harrison, 6; Tyler, 20; Polk, 9; Taylor, 7; Fillmore, 11; Pierce, 7; Buchanan, 14; Lincoln, 13; Johnson, 13; Grant, 25; Hayes, 10; Garfield, 7; Arthur, 17; Cleveland, 11; Harrison, 11; Cleveland, 12; McKinley, 15; Roosevelt, 29; Taft, 11; Wilson, 20.

### THE HAUNTED HOUSE.



many members of his official family as Tyler and Wilson. He had 19, divided as follows: five secretaries of the Treasury, four secretaries of State, three secretaries of War, three secretaries of the Navy, two postmasters general and two attorney-generals.

Grover Cleveland, who was the only President to stage a come-back after having been out of the White